

Mobility Committee Meeting Transcript –6/21/2017

Title: ATXN 24/7 Recording

Channel: 6 - ATXN

Recorded On: 6/21/2017 6:00:00 AM

Original Air Date: 6/21/2017

Transcript Generated by SnapStream

=====

Kitchen: We'll be starting the mobility committee meeting in about five minutes.

[3:10:20 PM]

>> Kitchen: Okay. Everyone, I think we're going to go ahead and get started, okay? I'm going to call to order the meeting of the mobility committee at about 3:10. So our first order of business, excuse me, is approval of the minutes. Do I have a motion? Motion from councilmember Flannigan, seconded by councilmember Garza. All those in favor? The minutes are passed. I believe we have two people for citizen communication. Thank you. Okay. We're going to start with Gus Pena. Mr. Pena? I don't see him here. Okay. Second we have David king. >> Thank you, chair and councilmembers. Thank you for your hard work for our city. I know we're fast growing and we have a lot of things that we need to take care of and I know y'all are working hard to take care of all these issues in our city. I speak about our city because we all know it's a changing city. We have a city in which we're growing rapidly. We're trying to densify a central part of our city and as we're growing we're seeing depopulation. Of low and middle income families to the low and outer edges of our city. And we know what's going on. And I know it's important and y'all are looking at this too to understand that issue and as it relates to mass transit. We have a denser central Austin and we have more transit options there because we have more folks there, and many of the folks moving here are high-income family so they get to take care of the more rich transit in the urban core while the urban families and

[3:12:21 PM]

the families of color pushed out to the edge are now struggling to get transportation options. And I know y'all are dealing with the different aspects of the changing environment for our city. I think it's

important that we understand that and that we be intentional in how we address urban transportation, mass transportation, affordable transportation to those families that are being pushed out to the edge of our city. So I think that we should be looking at some potential strategies such as if you're in the urban core and you're a high income family or high income that maybe you pay a surcharge on your mass transit. And to help subsidize transportation to low income families. And I don't know if we can legally do that. Probably not. And because I've said it the legislature is probably going to go pass a bill now that says we can't do that. And I know that y'all are wrestling with that too for different tools to address these issues. You know, you get -- slaughter sometimes limits you in what you can do. The legislature. I know there's not a silver bullet and not an easy thing to do. Another thing we should consider doing is looking at as the neighborhoods and the edge of our city start growing out, building out, that we look at them as complete communities like in Houston where they target different neighborhoods that have been underinvested for decades and they look at a comprehensive approach. If you're going to do a new development in those neighborhoods then they bring together the transit authorities, the city, all of the governmental entities, the developers, who say what can we do together to have a comprehensive plan for the new community we've building out here. So it's not just we have the housing, but we have no services. We have a plan upfront where we're looking at supporting that new affordable housing development, but we're also saying contractual like like they do in Houston that's there's a contract with the developers and these other governmental entities to provide those additional services over time.

[3:14:23 PM]

And then my last suggestion is on demand transportation services, it seems like a good opportunity for our local tncs to be providers of that on demand service to our low income families at no charge to those low income families. So I think that would be an important consideration, especially in the outer areas of our city where mass transit is more of a challenge. Thank you. >> Okay. We're going to start with our first item, a briefing on downtown Austin alliance, downtown Austin parking strategy. And just to help people understand the agenda today, we have two briefings. We're going to try to keep both of those briefings to 20 minutes or so. And then of course we'll have time for questions from councilmembers. >> Madam chair, Robert spillar, Austin transportation department. I wanted to introduce this presentation by downtown Austin alliance. The city of Austin and Austin transportation department specifically have been stakeholders in the development of this project. I can tell you I was excited from the minute I heard interest on the part of the daa in a parking analysis on the city. I think it's important is because of course the daa represents business groups and business organizations in the central business district that are affected by parking constraints, parking management issues and so forth. And so we're very excited that this is a grassroots developed program from within the business community, the downtown most affected area. So with that I'll turn it over to deece hurt. >> Thank you.

[3:16:24 PM]

I'm happy to present this information today. Weird ending one phrase and moving into the different strategy. The timing is right on this. There's a lot of information on this study and the implementation strategy that we believe can help in the codenext. Also the strategic mobility plan, the street design guide and also project connect. So as you listen to the presentation you will see there are opportunities where there's very valuable, robust information here that could be of great benefit. The reason why we the downtown alliance started this project, was for economic development purposes, looking at smaller sites in downtown Austin [lapse in audio], and also looking at congestion management. As rob stated, this is a private sector led initiative, although we did it in partnership with the Austin transportation department, the financial services department, the Texas facilities commission, the Austin planning commission, Travis county and cap metro. So with that I am going to turn the presentation over to Phil Olmstead. He's a senior associate with Nell ton igard, the consultant we used on the project. >> Thank you for having me and I appreciate your time. I want to thank the council and members of city staff and members of the staff of the downtown Austin alliance and the project steering committee who really provided their partnership and guidance throughout this effort. It's been a fun effort. It's been a challenging effort. This is parking. So I've yet to end on a parking project where everyone is happy with

[3:18:24 PM]

100% of what we do, but I think we've come up with a plan that's really going to position you guys to address some of the key challenges that you're facing. I'm going to recap our project. This is about a year and a half's worth of work. I'm going to try to do it in 20 minutes. So there's a lot of detail and that's contained in our various questions, so I'll pose these five questions and try to answer them for you. So why did we do this study? I think Dee hit on a number of these issues. Parking is central to your economic life in downtown. People drive, people are going to continue to drive for the foreseeable future so getting parking right, managing it well is really important. You have a lot of growth coming. And that's particularly challenging given that you don't have huge parcels anymore. You're frankly dealing with smaller parcels. So how you design, manage, supply parking is really crucial. Your biggest threat is not parking and traffic congestion, parking and managing it well can be a big way to manage that congestion and support your multimodal vision. We also did this study because affordability and equity are key concerns in downtown Austin and in Austin in general. Parking is one of the biggest determinants of housing costs. An effectively managed parking system can really go a long way to making sure and that service workers in particular have access to the parking system. There's a lot of perceptions around parking and for the first time we really dove into the data to really inform the management and the decision making as part of this process. Similarly if I've done my job well, if the parking is accessible, parking is a part of the downtown experience, but it's not defining the downtown experience. So what exactly did we do? One of the first things we did was work with the steering

committee to develop a set of goals to guide the project and its -- guide the project and its implementation. This is a set of goals to speak to the

[3:20:24 PM]

comprehensive approach that we wanted to take. We hold a lot of conversations with a lot of different people recognizing that there's many different opinions about parking in downtown so we really spent some time talking to folks. We held three rounds of community workshops, really trying to understand the perspectives from the different community members, the different stakeholders. Really helped us understand behind the story and test some ideas. Again really importantly we collected a ton of data. For the first time we went out and counted all your parking spaces. And the regulations and looked at how many cars are parked there. And really used that data to inform our recommendations. And the data is a snapshot in time, but what we've done is select downtown Austin alliance, the city up with a really strong data base by which they can continue to update this information and begin to use it and to inform decision making. So what did we find? I'll try to move through these quickly. This is in the various documents that we produced. You have about 71,500 parking stations in downtown. The vast are in parking garages. Most of the parking is off street so the interplay between the two and how you manage the two as a system is really important. We know, and I don't think this is any surprise, parking can be very difficult to find in your downtown, especially in the central business district, in certain retail corridors and at certain times of day. And this is a map showing occupancy so the darker colors indicate [indiscernible] Parks there. What we also saw from the data is that even when it's [lapse in audio]. There's about 25 to 30% of your parking spaces

[3:22:24 PM]

that go unused. That's not an equal distribution throughout your downtown. In the core -- in the central business district there's less viability. As you move to the edges there's more availability. What we're seeing is some spaces are going underutilize and we wanted to know why. The reason is the regulations. One in four of our spaces is never available to the general public. Another 33% are only open at certain times. So when a visitor comes to your downtown there's a very likely scenario that a good chunk of your parking supply they won't be able to access. To be frank, your parking rates are lower than what the demand would dictate. Your onstreet parking is in very high demand. It's a bargain and people are going to hunt and search for that bargain, especially relative to the price that is in your off street lot. Why would I pay five, six, seven, eight dollars an hour when if I drive around -- oh, by the way, creating lots of congestion, I might be able to find that dollar or \$1.25 space in an onstreet space? And of course, that creates a lot of challenges for folks when they can't find that space. It leads to frustration, leads to

dissatisfaction with the parking system. If they do find a space, we have sat in cars downtown and observed parking behavior over a 24 hour period. So this is east sixth street. What you see here is each row represents a parking space. The Orange block is a parking event. So you see some turnover happening in some of the spaces, but what we also saw, and this is also universal to every location that we looked at, cars are parking for eight, nine, 10 hours at a time. And that's a huge issue for your retail businesses. You're denying access to your customer, something that we really wanted to look at.

[3:24:28 PM]

Information is a challenge. There are many different types of signs, it creates confusion, where can I park, when can I park, is this public parking? So information is challenging and there's not realtime signage. So it's hard for people to find those available spaces. And if you do find it, there's multiple payment systems, there's a lot going on. In terms of how you access and utilize this system. Some of your spaces are underutilized frankly because some people don't want to walk to them. There's no sidewalks, no street trees. It can be a scary place. So these are things that seem simple on their face, but really could impact how your parking system is used. We know that a lot of people, particularly employees, try drive to work. That's okay. For many transit, biking, walking, carpooling, isn't an option. But we also know from the data that employees, residents, would like better and improved choice. So if you're able to provide those options, it's really important because for every trip you can shift, you free up a parking space. We know that growth is coming to the downtown. We did a land use analysis and I won't go into the detail, but the long and short of it is given the amount of growth you're seeing in your downtown, and projecting for your downtown, more supply should be part of the equation. It should be on the table as part of the recommendations. How you provide that supply is also really important. Providing more parking is not the only answer. You simply can't build your way out of your management challenges. So what are we recommending? We have a set of 19 recommendations. Organized in thick strategy buckets. I want to be clear, there's no silver bullet to your parking problems. You cannot just do one of these and call it a day. What we tried to do is

[3:26:28 PM]

set up a package of recommendations that are designed to support one another. You don't have to do all of this at once and you don't have to do it tomorrow. There are things that we think you can move forward in the short-term and there are some things that are really important to move to in the long-term. I'm going to highlight some of them for you all. So one of the core representations, one of the major recommendations is to implement what we call [indiscernible]. That is adjusting parking rates and information to respond to demand so when demand goes up you raise the rates. When demand goes

down or when it's lower or at less busy times you lower the rates. The whole is to improve availability of your parking system. So what this operationally means is you're going to set the city with a target and over time adjusting to find that sweet spot of demand. To be clear this will mean that your most popular spaces will be more expensive, but as you move away from the central business district, from the most popular corridors, you would actually think about lowering your prices. Simple is better. This is a data driven process in which you're really using data to drive these decisions and really wheat these targets. This is something that Seattle has been doing since 2011. It's one model. They calibrate their prices by location and by time of day. They collect data a couple of times a year and then make rate adjustments once a year to try to meet their availability target. In their latest round in 2016 they raised prices, kept prices the same in

[3:28:29 PM]

25% and actually kept prices the same in 25%. Another recommendation is doing as much as you can to continue to work with the private sector to make private parking available for public use. We know again that a lot of parking goes underutilized simply because people can't access it. And so private property owners have very legitimate concerns about opening up their parking to the public. That is not unique to Austin. We have overcome that in many communities with solid share parking agreements that address liability, that address cost, that address maintenance, that address security. These are things that can be overcome. To be clear, this would not be mandatory. This would not be pulltury. We would be looking for almost private property owners. In our discussions we have heard from folks that are interested in this idea. This could go many different ways. It could be a public private thing or it could be a private-private partnership. Really part of this recommendation is really improving information sharing. Sacramento does this, the city leases parking from the state. They upgraded all the facilities and have collected revenue to cover their investment and they actually share the additional revenue with the state as part of a cost sharing agreement. You guys are already sharing. We think your affordable parking program is a national best practice and should be expanded. It's one of the best ways that you guys have come up with to address some of the equity challenges that employees face. It should be expanded geographically. It should be expanded by time of day. Information is crucial. Again, if people don't know where to find parking or how to find it, it's not going to get used efficiently. So really being comprehensive, coming up with a comprehensive signage and wayfinding program is going to be

[3:30:29 PM]

essential. And making sure you're using realtime information. The technology is such that you can have realtime information on the ground and it can be paired with smartphone appears, be prepared with the website and really provide that technological customer convenience that people are seeking.

Technology is really important. This is something that the city is already looking at. We think it's great. You really need to coordinate that technology across your downtown and do as much as you can to get rid of duplicate systems. It's really creating confusion amongst customers. This was not a transit study but one of the things we looked at and one of the things we had merit was an understand around a circulator shuttle. Not only would this improve access throughout your downtown, but could be a big part of a remote parking strategy. So again providing easier, more direct access to some of your more remote parking facilities that are used to a lesser degree. We really think you need some conversations with capital metro to come up with the right service plan so you're not duplicating service, you're coming up with the most cost effective model. Really investing in mobility for employees. We know that many employees need to drive and will continue to drive, but we know there are some that have more choice. Companies are more and more positioning mobility as a core benefit much like you would health care and 401(k)s. This is important. The tma is doing a great job and just needs resources to bring this to bear I think downtown. Something Columbus, Ohio has done, they did a transit pass pilot program. They saw tremendous transit use increase with those pilot participants. So they're providing free transit passes to 40,000 employees in their downtown. At the cost of five million dollars, but their estimating that

[3:32:29 PM]

with that transit use they can free up 2400 parking spaces. There is no way you could ever build 2400 parking spaces with five million dollars. We made a number and looked at a number of things in the code. These are high level concepts that really need to be more thoroughly vetted. I know there was some more conversation with codenext. This needs to be integrated in that process. These are concepts for further discussion. One of the things we think is important is transportation demand management as part of the approval process. Really thinking about how new development can continue to support mobility programs. No one wants a parking ticket. You have to enforce the rules. We know from our data that people are abusing the time limits and it's really impacting the efficiency of your parking system. The involvement staff here in unautan do a great job with the tools they have. They're really invested in strong customer service, but we think floor some enhancements that can be made particularly with some new tools as well as being really focused on certain behaviors and using core metrics to guide enforcement. Collaboration is going to be key. One of the key parts of implementation is really moving this forward and formalizing ongoing dialogue. I think we've established good dialogue as part of this project, but working with all these different stakeholders to really advance this plan. You guys have a ton of events, some of the biggest in the world. By and large you do a great job managing those events. We think there's some additional opportunities to improve thinking about peak pricing, thinking about ways to get more advanced information out to event Goers. And with new tools and

technologies really being able to have realtime information with your inventory and being able to manage

[3:34:31 PM]

loading and access really efficiently. Planning for the future. Technology, we know is going to change parking demand. We don't know to what degree and when. But there are estimates that 80% of parking demand in urban environments could go away with a future in which 100% of vehicles are autonomous. We're a long way from that, but it is something to start thinking about. What does that mean for the curb? What does that mean for all your parking structures? What does it mean for menu revenue? These are things you all have to start thinking about and really getting the policies out there in front of the technologies. Again, looking at the amount of growth you're having new supply is only part of the solution. It can't be the only solution. Looking at the ways you partner with the private sector to make as much of the new supply public and managed as part of the shared system. And really being strategy in how you supply that new parking. There's a bunch of other parking recommendations. I'd be happy to answer those. They're in the report. And we know that action is needed. One of the first thanks Dee said to me is I don't want another plan on the shelf. There are huge parking problems now. We need to move things forward. I spent a lot of time with his staff and the city staff talking about next steps and coming with an implementation plan. Again, there's no silver bullet. We have a priority action plan, set of 10 initiatives that we can move forward. We demonstrate progress. And I'll turn it back to Dee to talk about that briefly. >> And we'll have questions here, but very briefly. So on next steps, we think having this priority action team basically acting as an advisory group to push this agenda forward and

[3:36:31 PM]

we're looking at immediate actions between 18 months and two years. And we envision the team coming back to the mobility committee with some basic recommendations. Not prepared to do that today obviously. We want to put a team together to agree on that and really look at it, but things focused on performance based management, shared parking and [lapse in audio]. So happy to answer any questions. >> Kitchen: Any questions from my colleagues? Okay. I'll start. So I want to talk for a minute about the parking program for employees downtown. You mentioned it was the best practice, but some recommendations around it might be to I think you said expand [lapse in audio] That all of us are completely familiar with that particular program. So can you talk to us about what you like in the practice about it? >> You have an affordable parking program that provides discounted parking at the waller creek garage. And it's available to employees. They can buy that permit. It's at a much lower rate than they would find on the open market. They can actually share it amongst employees so you can

even get a bigger discount. And it really is targeted -- I don't want to speak for city staff, but I think the intent was that the issues they've heard around, you know, lower income, shift workers coming in, retail workers, we can't find places on the street. We can't afford to park in these garages. We need a more affordable option. It's one of the few examples I have seen where you're specifically targeting that issue. So that's why I classify it as a best practice. And I think from what we've heard and heard from city staff that

[3:38:33 PM]

that program has shown great promise and has been expanded beyond the waller creek garage and beyond the times in which it's currently allowed. Not just to provide access for nighttime employees, but to think about those working in daytime. >> Kitchen: Okay. So have you -- let's talk about that specifically. I would imagine having it only in one place can be limiting for folks that are working relatively far from that location, particularly if they're coming back late at night from a safety perspective. So is that one of the reasons that you found that it might be useful to expand the geographic area that that could occur in? >> That's exactly one of the reasons, one of the core reasons. Folks get out of work at 3:00 A.M. And you woman want to walk a certain amount of way, so that's a big part of that program. But again, providing that geographic distribution to help other retail corridors within the downtown, to help other employees that are struggling with similar issues and being able to access the existing parking system. >> Kitchen: Okay. Is part of your outreach to the community, help me understand what kind of outreach there was with the downtown workers. >> So we did a multifaceted outreach program. We did about three community workshops, which the team here reached out to businesses, to employers, to employees. We did an online survey that was distributed throughout downtown and we got quite a number of responses from employees there as well. And that survey asked a number of different questions both about existing issues and challenges, where they're coming from, the demographics that you're

[3:40:34 PM]

dealing with as well as testing some ideas around recommendation with them. Those would be the core ways. I know Dee and his team have been having numerous conversations with the business community, with employers. We held a workshop at a stakeholder meeting specifically targeted at downtown businesses. We did our best to reach out to those folks. >> Kitchen: Okay. I'm wanting to make sure that we understand for the lower wage workers in particular that have difficulties with accessing parking, wanting to make sure that we understand all the gaps that they may be experiences. So it's a great program that we have but this is also an opportunity to see what else we can do with it, as you

suggested in one of your recommendations. Is there any other aspect of what you all uncovered with regard to the workers that you would speak to in terms of recommendations? Anything that you're aware of? >> I could jump in. One of the big recommendations is around mobility programs for employees. Movability Austin is really doing a great job and beginning that conversation is working with employers everyday to provide additional mobility programs. So this is stuff like transit passes, information about commute options. Those different types of programs. A lot of people see that somewhat disconnected from parking, but it's a flip side to the coin. It's about providing more mobility choice and figuring out ways to come at it from the demand side. So every employee you can get on a different mode you can really do a lot to improve the efficiency of the parking system. >> The survey results I think are telling -- if I recall the figure correctly, it was about 75% of the respondents wanted an alternate modes of transportation.

[3:42:37 PM]

So if there were alternate ways to get to work, that was sort of a preferred solution for workers in downtown. >> Kitchen: Did you find that also for the late night workers? Or did you break out the data? >> I don't know that we sliced it that way, but I would assume. >> Kitchen: Other questions? Go ahead. >> Flannigan: The comparison between the hourly rate we charge at the meter versus the hourly rate charged on private owned parking, that one dollar to \$1.25 is in order of magnitude. If you look at other cities they have those that are significantly smaller. You mentioned that ours are really large -- >> Not atypical in a downtown that's struggling with managing demand, right? The person who comes to any business, their first -- the hierarchy of parking demand is people are going to look for that front door onstreet space first and if it's cheap then go for it. So when we talk about managing the system as a whole and thinking about how off street and onstreet come together what we really want to try to do is set the pricing signals so not everyone is rushing to your onstreet spaces and ignoring your off street supply. So a lot of cities get into trouble when you have very expensive off street parking around very cheap onstreet parking. The prices are such that people will circle and circle and circle. >> Flannigan: I understand that. What I'm asking more so is when you look at other cities that are trying to address -- because there were case studies all throughout your report and I kind of skimmed through this and saw there were even more. Is our demand pricing gap larger or smaller than the other cities? >> I would say given the demand you have for onstreet spaces the demand is pretty

[3:44:38 PM]

relative to some cities. But that -- for Seattle, for San Francisco, that was the case when they started to address this problem as well. So it's a similar starting point, I think, for many of the cities we have seen.

>> Flannigan: And one more question. When you looked at the off street parking that exists in downtown, how much of that -- you can answer ballpark. How much of that were independently owned, one lot or garage owned by one company with one system of parking management, versus the off street approximate parking managed by a similar company with similar technology? And what I'm going to here is are there two or three private parking companies that own a significant number of spaces that make the ability to achieve some economies of scale faster than trying to define individual owners? >> It's definitely a mix. We could get that for you. And we can look back at the data. There's definitely a mix. You have a lot of small oneoffs, but we also met with the -- the five or six, seven major parking operators in downtown and there's definitely opportunities for economies of scale. >> Flannigan: Before I became a councilmember I worked at one American center and they changed their parking technology while they worked there to start using textags. So as you come up to the gate there's a txtag and no one else was doing it. There's not even economies of scale for them to use the technology. They also make the decisions independently and it exacerbates the issue. >> It's one of the challenges we saw. It's not just the payment systems, not just the technology, it's the signage. You can go from one lot and really literally next door. You have a different app, you have a different sign. You have a different parking meter. And if you're the average visitor coming to your downtown, hey, I

[3:46:39 PM]

just downloaded this parking app and the next day you come, oh, I have to do a whole other parking app? And it leads to the angst that people have when they come to visit here. So really obviously private owners are managing in their way, for the best interest of their clients. What we're trying to do is work with the city, with the different stakeholders to do as much coordination as we can. >> Kitchen: Councilmember Garza? >> Garza: With regard to about [lapse in audio]. The workers are the very ones using those and having to go to the lunch break to pay that meter so they would be affected in any increase in a ticket and they're the ones that were trying to. So maybe that would be a later implementation after we open up the options for everyone is a suggestion I would make. >> I think that's core to all of the recommendations as you want to do is in an order where you're providing the options before you're disincentivizing and penalizing people. So you have the 19 different solution sets and you need to be very strategic about what you do in what way. >> Garza: And northward to the recommendation of the circulator, was that recommendation done before chariot came in? And I'm wondering if it -- I guess I'll stop there and then ask a follow-up. >> I mean, we've been developing the recommendations for, you know, six to nine months. You know, that could potentially be one model. We did not in this part of the study say city or stakeholders do this model.

[3:48:39 PM]

I think that would be part of the next steps of moving that recommendation forward. Is working with cap metro, working with employers, working with the downtown Austin alliance to figure out what that service model might be. Chariot may be part of the answer. >> Garza: Okay. That's what I was just curious if it -- have they been here long enough to get any data on if they are helping improve the situation. >> I have not looked at that. >> I know through movability Austin, downtown Austin alliance we manage movability Austin. We've tried pilots with chariot, with a couple of employers. So we're beginning to build this -- the information. But we have been talking to chariot. >> Garza: Okay, thanks. >> Alter: First of all, I would like to thank downtown Austin alliance for taking the lead on this. I think it's really important that the private and the non-profit help us solve our mobility problem. Thank you for taking the lead on this. I would like more clarification on the city's role in the process. Where is it that you need us to be taking action? Obviously we control the meter rates and we control the use of our public parking facilities. Because I'm trying to understand how we are going to -- what our role is in influencing the private sector in this. Obviously you as a group of private sector folks have an opportunity do that, but I would like some greater clarity on what your expectations are for the city in that regard. >> Kitchen: Our city staff is here too so they can respond if you would like. But you guys go first. >> Alter: In a perfect world. >> Yeah. The city's a core partner. And you guys I think are going to have a role to play in all different

[3:50:39 PM]

pieces of this plan. That said, I think there's different parts of it that can move forward without city participation. There's obviously pieces that need your buy in and need that policy direction. So when we talk about next steps there will be certain parts related to the code, anything related to the performance based management and how you manage your spaces. The team will be coming back to you, so exactly where and when I don't think we can answer that yet. That's really part of this next phase is setting that up and defining exactly when and where we'll be coming to you. >> Right. Hi, Robert spillar, Austin transportation department. I would agree with that. You know what's interesting is I think this study really points out that we need to start thinking about the parking system as both the parking elements that we own as the parking elements that we have ability to influence. And so something as simple as I had not realized until the study got into it that shared use parking is an overlay of zoning. Every building that builds parking automatically doesn't have ability to sell that parking after hours, for instance. And I think that's a place where the city can also take leadership is to remove the barriers that for whatever reason were put in place so we can begin to unlock those opportunities. And to go even further, if that doesn't work we have contemplated before is bringing on a virtual parking system where in a sense I think it was like San Diego where the city actually leases the access space after certain times and operates it for public use. I think we need to take as a city itself an assessment of all of its parking assets. There are some parking assets that I'm not sure are routinely managed for the public.

[3:52:42 PM]

For various reasons and I think those are ones that we should look at as well. I think it's a good partnership. As you mention order alluded to, there are certain areas where we have direct ownership, but I think there are areas that we have influence over. The wayfinding technology we just installed our first sign at the Seaholm garage. It will soon on -- we will soon be installing that same technology here at city hall. We hope to encourage private operators to use the same technology. And we would aggregate the data so that a single parking application or any application in an open format, could take advantage of that. But by aggregating and even communicating out where parking available whether we own the garage or not, could be an opportunity to begin to move towards consolidated parking system. Whether we own more or remain in an influencing position. >> It's important to remember -- I think it's important to remember that about 65% of the parking is controlled/owned by the private sector and about 35 is public sector. And the city is just a portion of that public sector. So we have to make improvements, so to speak, across the board. So as bill mentioned, I don't think we need to get everything done immediately. Small steps are going to make a big difference. >> Alter: I would assume this is part of your plan, but if it's not, when you do come back to us it would be helpful to have some of that a little bit more explicit so that we can help you in making sure that this gets shepherded through various city processes. >> Our intent is when we have consensus of this advisory committee is to have a schedule and here are the items we think we need to address and when. And the impacts we believe those will have. >> Alter: Thank you. I saw a slide in here

[3:54:43 PM]

that was looking at the capitol parking. And we have this sort of bizarre situation where we have a legislature which is only here six months out of every two years. So we hope it lends itself to that. That means there's likely a lot of parking that's not being used in downtown area. It seems like there would be at least for the time when they're not in full session there are some great opportunities there because they do have those parking structures. So I'm excited to see where you're going with that. The last thing I wanted to just mention was I hope you will coordinate with our sidewalk master plan so that as we're doing that we take into consideration any changes that need to happen with curb cuts and things like that. And I want to make sure if we go down the route of raising the prices of our meter meters that how we manage that rollout will be really important. I've always marveled at how cheap it is to park in downtown Austin and enjoyed that myself and I don't know that the rest of the public is going to realize that when we raise prices that we're not just trying to get revenue, but we're actually trying to manage demand and get them to shift their choices. So how we manage that rollout and how we message that is going to be very critical for this success. And I suspect we can learn from other cities, but I see a disaster waiting to happen if we don't do that carefully. >> Kitchen: I have a few just remaining questions. Let's see. So you spoke briefly for cars parking eight to 10 hours and that sort of thing. And

councilmember Garza expressed her concern about how careful we need to be in terms of enforcement. But what kind of data do you have? Were you able to gather

[3:56:43 PM]

data about -- or maybe our staff has data about why people are parking for so long? We may not have that data, but I'm curious if you have any data around that. >> I think there's a couple of core reasons. One is that what we've alluded to and talked about is that the off street parking hereby is really expensive. And it doesn't provide that same affordable choice. So a lot of times people if they find that they get here early they're going to park in that onstreet space. And frankly take their chances with a ticket or move their cars every couple of hours, which is problematic for a couple of reasons. You get 100 people moving their cars every couple of hours, that's a lot of congestion on the downtown streets. I would say that's a core reason. There are reasons related to people don't know where available parking is. One of the big findings again was that a lot of the parking that is available the average person or employee simply doesn't have access to it. We don't have specific data. We didn't do like a license plate survey and do intercept surveys about why that individual parker made that choice, but we can certainly infer from all the different data points that we have. >> I would add one point, that we obviously have a lot of construction going on in our downtown and anecdotal it would appear to me that it is unique when a developer plans for where their construction workers park. Sometimes that is within the closed off area around the construction site, but we know we have many individually owned pickup trucks and vehicles that would appear to be construction oriented parked on many of our

[3:58:44 PM]

blocks. That's been a frustration I know for several existing businesses that we've tried to focus on and get employees to park elsewhere. Those employers that have in the past had plans, you will see them parking in the palmer center or other locations, but I will tell you that's a rarity in terms of all the development going on. >> Kitchen: Okay, thank you. The last question then would just be related to code changes. Is this code changes that relate to parking, you mentioned the overlay zoning issue. Are these kind of code changes -- where in our code process will we be looking at those, I guess? We just had a long conversation about today we're basically going to be spending the summer and the fall going through our land commissions. As you know, planning commission and zoning or zap. So before it comes to us in the beginning of next year. So somewhere in that process I assume -- I don't need all the details now, but I'm assuming that somewhere in that process the code changes that might relate to the kind of parking issues that were talking about will be at least surfaced, right? Is that making sense? I think you will hear some more of that in a few minutes when she presents on the other planning activities going

on right now. It is very appropriate timing to be having those conversations as we discuss codenext or any of the interim provisions.

[4:00:44 PM]

With regards to the overlay, I could imagine the council might want to take earlier action on that, depending on the schedule and codenext because it would suddenly change the downtown parking landscape >> Kitchen: Thank you. Do y'all have other questions? Thank you very much. We really appreciate your time today and thank you. The presentation was very well laid out, and I always like lists, particularly a list of problems and list of recommendations. It makes it easier to follow. So thank you. Appreciate it. Thank you. Okay. Our next item is staff briefing on the street impact fee study. >> Afternoon, councilmembers. Is this on? Good afternoon. Austin transportation department, and I'm pleased to be here this afternoon to give you an update on the street impact fee study we're conducting that was funded in the 2016 budget by council. A reminder this would be the first time to have a street impact fee for Austin. We've had water wastewater impact fees since the '90s but have not implemented a street impact fee so we are on our way with this study. The presentation -- oopsy. We'll continue in a moment. Okay. This presentation will go over the following items, mobility initiatives coordination. We have a lot going on so we always like to start with showing how all of these initiatives are related to each other. And then go into what are street impact fees, basic definition, what are the street impact fee steps and components to developing a program, what do street

[4:02:46 PM]

impact fees pay for, what problem are street impact fees trying to solve, how do street impact fees relate to our current process for mobility mitigation and of course the project time line and how everyone can keep abreast of how the project is progressing and also engage with us about the project. So initiatives coordination. These three initiatives here, and I'll talk about the council strategic plan in a second but the Austin strategy mobility plan, codenext and the street impact fee study all are related by what we call the street network table and the street network table by definition is an inventory of our streets, their existing conditions, and what their future conditions should be based on a plan. So we are currently updating that plan, which is the Austin strategic mobility plan. Where do we need to be in ten, 20, 30 years? What do our streets need to look like? What -- how do they need to function in order to meet that vision and that scenario that we all agree upon in the strategic mobility plan? So that end result needs space to operate. That's our right-of-way. So the right-of-way, as we update the street network table, will change when we do the street network plan. Some streets, the right-of-way will be sufficient, depending on what we're planning for with what we have now. In some cases we may need

more. In some cases we may need less. So the relationship to codenext is that right-of-way dedication is a component of our regulatory environment through the development review process, through our current code, and of course right-of-way dedication is going to carry through into codenext. It's in the draft know. I don't anticipate it would come out. That's how that's related. We're updating that table. The way we get dedication is through the land development code. We also get other transportation improvements through other components required by the land

[4:04:46 PM]

development code three tias and other mechanisms so the roadway table is going to be look at what are those projects and space needed. Street impact fees relate to the table in two ways, really. One, as we develop the program, the cost of the projects that we identify are borne out of the strategic mobility plan. There will be a subset of the roadway table from a roadway capacity standpoint. Secondly, it's an implementation tool to implement the plan. So all of those are tied together through the street network table and then the transportation criteria manual we did release our street design guide yesterday, which is a precursor to updating criteria manual on cross-sections and what -- how the various components of the roadway table need to be designed and the space required, which also relates to the right-of-way needed. The council strategic plan, the mobility outcome, the -- will be informed by the information that we are developing now with the Austin strategic mobility plan. So we'll be working closely -- through the process as they go through their first outcome, how we can best coordinate to make sure we are informing that process. Here's a time line. So all of these processes, all these initiatives, including the corridor construction program there at the top, will be coming to conclusion in 2018. And there's a lot of coordination points that staff is working on through all of these that are shown on the screen. So there's a lot of coordination happening between the various divisions within transportation, between different offices, so that we can lead towards completion, successful completion of these projects in 2018. So now to the main feature, street impact fees.

[4:06:46 PM]

Definition, what is a street impact fee? Simply put, it's a one-time fee for new development and a calculation to determine the cost of growth for street infrastructure. What are the components? So I'll first start by saying the components are laid out for us in state law. The local government code is very prescriptive on how a city can develop a street impact fee policy. So the first step that's required is to develop service areas and land use assumptions. The second step is to create the street network table that I just talked about that's being updated with the strategic mobility plan and pulling a subset of roadway capacity projects identified to meet the future growth needs of the city that will be the basis

for the fee. Then you do the fee calculation, and you assess develop the ordinance where the fee is flexible depending on council action. More detail. Service areas. The funds that are collected within a service area -- whoops. That jumped a little bit. Sorry -- have to be spent within the service area and they have to be spent within ten years. So in comparison to the service area for the water impact fee, the water utility has the whole city as their service area. For transportation, our service areas cannot be more than 6 miles. It's -- and it doesn't say -- it doesn't say exactly how to do that in the local government code, but different from the water fee. We are -- we have to create our service areas not to exceed 6 miles in length. So how have we done that? This is a draft of 17 areas. This has been an iterative process -- I'm sorry that keeps doing that. Staff has been working on this for a while now, and it's important to note our strategy, which is looking at geography, natural breaks

[4:08:46 PM]

in service areas, and most importantly, transportation characteristics. We want areas that have similar transportation characteristics. What are things we are considering? Of course in -- geography, Colorado river, hill country, downtown as a special area, looking at the loop theme that we've had with our transportation network and of course highway boundaries. We are still receiving feedback on this, and are working -- you know, it's a balancing act because we have that 6-mile constraint. >> Kitchen: Can I ask a quick question? >> Absolutely. >> Kitchen: So the areas, the service areas, those inform the impact fee -- the eventual calculation of the impact fees, right? >> Correct. >> Kitchen: Because different parts of town the fee is different because the transportation needs are different, right? Is that -- >> Well, yes. The total cost of the projects that we identify to address the future needs in those areas will be different, depending on the needs of those areas. Absolutely. But how the fee eventually is set and to what degree, do you want to go with the max, do you want to go with half or zero or whatever is a council decision. >> Kitchen: I know. I'm trying to understand the purpose behind the -- setting these areas. That's what I'm trying to connect. >> Yeah, well, the purpose is set forward in the local government code, that we have to -- they can't -- we have to have service areas that don't exceed 6 miles. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> We've interpreted that. In Texas, quite frankly, the other cities that have incorporated impact fees are under the same constraints. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> So we, as urban planners we've decided the best way to look at that is, you know, natural boundaries, highway boundaries, and travel characteristics. >> Kitchen: So, like -- so these are 6-mile boundaries? >> Yes. >> Kitchen: And each of these areas it's 6 miles. >> Yeah, from one point to any other point in these areas would not exceed 6 miles.

[4:10:47 PM]

>> Kitchen: Gotcha, okay. >> Flannigan: So help me understand. The way the slide reads, , you -- the fee you may charge a project in a service area can only be spent on projects in that service area? >> Correct. >> Flannigan: Based on the rough analysis of this map, if I have a project that's getting built in the domain, I can't . Duval road on the other side of mopac. >> No, not IFS in the same service area. >> Flannigan: Even projects on the edge of a service area -- >> The only way you would split is if the actual boundary is a roadway and it would be split half and half. >> Flannigan: Sure. I can understand that. But that -- >> That makes me nervous. >> Flannigan: That's kind of problematic. >> Could be. >> Flannigan: I think it is. I think it is problematic, because especially when we've used the major roadways as the dividing lines, there are going to be a lot of projects right there, and if that project sits just to this side of the road -- >> Sure. >> Flannigan: -- I can't fix the intersection that leads to that road coming from the other service area. >> Sure. >> Flannigan: That's a problem. >> Right. It's -- yeah. It's not a perfect system, but it -- you know, it's -- you know, we'll have to work through -- as we develop the roadway capacity plan we'll go into that step and how we're looking at that, we certainly need to keep that in mind. >> Kitchen: Can I ask one question? I'm sorry we're bogging you down in the very first -- we'll let you get through it, but one other question then. For the service areas, do they -- does it have to be static or I guess I was thinking -- and I may have been wrong -- totally confused about this, but I was thinking that when you charged the impact fee for a particular development, you could only spend that amount within 6 miles. But it sounds to me like it's not -- that I misunderstood that. That it's more that you

[4:12:47 PM]

establish the service areas up front. You don't do it 6 miles -- the 6 miles doesn't relate to the particular project. It relates to the -- >> Correct. >> Kitchen: Okay, gotcha. >> That's right. That's a good distinction. >> Kitchen: That was a misunderstanding I had. I thought it was the particular project. >> Alter: Is there a way you could have the service areas for, like, the costs and for, like, determining things, but that if the project was within 6 miles of the project that's getting assessed the fee, that that would be okay? So your service areas determine the costs that you would be able to pay, but that as long as the improvement was in -- within 6 miles of the project you could do that? >> I have to ask our -- that's a legal question, I believe. >> Alter: Okay. >> We'll jot it down and definitely route that answer back through to you, but it's an interpretation, as I said, the local government code just basically states the 6 miles and obviously there's a lot of questions around how that is measured. There's, you know, precedent we have with other Texas cities who have done this and how they do it, but that's a question we can certainly ask. >> Alter: Yeah. Because I would have a strong concern about, you know, the boundaries being our corridors and that's why we want the development or is this only applying to those cases of that 2,000 trips or less so it's not a huge -- >> No. This is all development, and I'll get into that, how this is different to our current practices. >> Alter: Okay, thank you. >> Flannigan: Was any consideration -- sorry. >> Kitchen: Go ahead. >> Flannigan: Was any consideration given to drawing the boundaries by a traffic shed or a travel shed as opposed to using the corridors themselves as the lines? >> Yes. Our consultant and our staff planners did look at travel characteristics, and definitely that was an

input. >> Flannigan: But you decided not to use that to -- >> Well, we couldn't use it solely because in some cases it was 6 miles or it wasn't 6 miles but it was -- you know, the travel

[4:14:48 PM]

characteristics of an area, trip lanes, that type of thing, were one of the things we considered. >> Flannigan: Okay. >> Kitchen: Let's keep going. >> Okay. >> Kitchen: I think we have a lot of questions about the service areas, so we'll -- what we'll try to do is also capture any additional questions we have so that we can share it. >> Definitely. Thank you. >> Kitchen: Okay. Step one in the land use assumptions, we worked very closely with the water utility, who is doing their mandatory five-year update, local government code requires that cities that have an impact fee update, the land use assumptions and the allowedway capacity plan -- roadway capacity plan every five years, so the water utility started their five-year update around the time we're starting so we're coordinating with them. We pulled in Ryan Robinson from the planning department and came up with a process that is working, that looks at the imagine Austin growth concept map, existing and future land use, and the emerging projects data that the planning department holds. So for street impact fees, the service unit that we're using is essentially trips, which are generated based on different land use characteristics. So you look at the number of dwelling units that you see into the future that are coming, and then you look at employment trips by way of commercial square footage. And our ten-year horizon for this program is 2017 through 2027. This is a little bit small print. I apologize. But the point here is that where we landed on our land use assumptions, which are very, very close with regard to order of magnitude to the water utility's assumptions, so we feel very good about it, is 124,000 some odd units of residential and about 76 million some odd commercial square footage.

[4:16:49 PM]

Which is what is imposing into the calculation. And -- going into the calculation. We are aware of codenext and we will be able to pivot and adjust as needed, as per the codenext process. >> Alter: When it says the employment trips by trip, is it just basic service and retail for the -- >> Office? Office and retail? >> Does it make a distinction between medical and non-medical office? >> Ooh. I believe it does. Because we're using -- we're using the ite trip generation rates, ultimately, which do go into some detail. >> So if I'm familiar with a tia, it's the same chart that you're using that they reference in the tia so it would be the same distinctions. >> Correct. >> It's just not referenced in your chart here? >> Exactly, yes. >> Alter: Thank you. >> Step two, once you've done your service areas and you've done your land use assumptions, so you have an -- essentially you have a prediction of how many units, how much -- how many trips are going to happen in each service area, we then create this roadway capacity plan. The

projects included in roadway capacity plan are street segments, so new roads, creating new connectivity, widening of roads and access management is also considered capacity because of the removal of left turn friction and other things, interpretation improvements, obviously -- intersection improvements, signal, turn lanes, special intersections and bond projects is on the list because we are going back and looking at past mobility projects, back to the 2006 bond program, to look at what projects were capacity-related projects because you can pay bond debt with the street impact fee. >> Kitchen: So is -- am I --

[4:18:50 PM]

would I be correct in thinking about this as the list of everything that needs to be fixed? On our roads? >> No. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Because there's other things -- there will be other standalone projects, such as sidewalks or bicycle projects that maybe are not part of -- you know, I'm going to go into the next -- one of the next slides will talk about what you can and can't pay for with street impact fees, and essentially our cross-section that we have in our criteria manual, a complete streets cross-section that could include streetlights to bicycle facilities to, you know, turning -- to turn lanes, number of lanes for motor vehicles, et cetera, can be paid for but standalone projects -- so I would imagine it will, the strategic mobility plan will identify lots of different types of projects, including safety projects that are not capacity projects, that might not be in the roadway capacity plan. So there are subtle differences in why this is a subset of that entire plan that we need to meet all of our mobility goals at the city, which we know are changing, are not just getting from A to B but looking at safety and looking at all the other things. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Alter: Maui ask if the same -- may ask if the same rules apply whether it's a new development or if it's existing roads? >> It would be the same. For the impact fee? >> Alter: It seems like if it's a new development they've got to build their roads, as I understand it, whereas if it's an existing development being built along -- anyway, if it's a new development being built along existing roads with no new roads being created then you do the impact fee. >> The impact fee would apply in each scenario. The key difference would be what type -- what project is in the roadway capacity plan. So the fee can only apply to a project that's in the roadway capacity plan.

[4:20:51 PM]

So to the extent that a road is in the roadway capacity plan that's a new road at -- that a development is adjacent to, or in the service area that could apply, the projects may be different related to a project that's in more of a redevelopment or infill scenario. >> Alter: Okay. I want to -- I want to understand that. You don't have to stop now but -- >> Kitchen: I'm going to suggest a time check right now. It's 4:20 already and you have a lot more to get through. >> I've got nine more slides. >> Kitchen: If it's okay with

everyone, why don't we let her get through the rest of them. I know we all have a lot of questions, so why don't we do that and then we'll ask questions as long as we have time for. >> Okay. Hold that thought. We'll go through. Might answer it in a couple slides, might not, but we'll be able to answer afterwards. The roadway capacity plan will consist of these projects, including any bond projects that we, in reviewing them, feel meet the capacity requirement here. This is how the fees calculated, I already said this, this is essentially the way you can think about it -- why does that keep doing that? I apologize the total cost of all of those projects that we've identified in each service area are going to equal certain costs divided by those units and the trip rates and vehicle miles that are generated. So it's a simple way of looking at growth. And the cost of growth. When we set the policy ordinance, which is the last step in the process, that involves rate setting and revenue forecasting, and I like to mention that in talking with Fort Worth, which is the largest city in Texas currently that has street impact fees, their current revenue is \$12 million per year, and they've been in place for almost ten years now, and that's how much they bring in, just to give you a

[4:22:52 PM]

concept of what we're -- you know, what's possible. And I'll also say, when I get to schedule, that from when they started their study, which is where we are now, we're about six months into our study, to when they collected their first fee was about three years, just to set that expectation. Of that this does take some time to work through. There's a lot of questions and technical analysis that needs to happen and a lot of discussion when you start getting into the policy. So a quick overview of what they can pay for. We alluded at this earlier. We cannot pay for operations, maintenance, or complete reconstruction, which is capital renewal. We can only pay for improvements that are related to accommodating new growth. A little nuance here is that, you know, these days we're so efficient with our capital programming, capital planning, that it would be rare to do a complete reconstruction without some analysis of how we can do, you know, some capacity-related improvements as well, whether it be signal or intersection improvements. But essentially that's the difference. So this is a more detailed list, and the important part of this slide is what can be paid for is what I just talked about. I alluded to this before, it's additional lanes and also other appurtenances of the roadway, which would include sidewalks, bicycle facilities, streetlights if that's part of our criteria manual for roads. Intersection improvements. What's also important is we can pay for preliminary engineering, surveying and engineering fees, land acquisition, and I said this before, debt service on past projects and also we can use the fees to help with the mandatory five-year update. Again, what we can't use the fee for is operations and maintenance, upgrades to serve existing development, and the administrative costs of operating the program.

[4:24:55 PM]

So what problem are we trying to solve by implementing a street impact fee? Simply, we're trying to develop a better method to pay for growth that is equitable, predictable and transparent. We want -- you know, we want to continually improve how we do business here at the city. So this is a good example of how we're going to do that. So our current process, in order to make it more equitable, the difference is that right now sites required to do a tia are paying into the system. Sites that don't do not pay in the system. Now, there's a nuance. This is historical. We've recently passed the mitigation ordinance which changes that a little bit but historically, the past 20 years plus, this is how it's been. The difference will be this will be scalable from a very small development to a large development, the fee is scalable and everyone is going to pay, you know, comparable to the effect they're having on the network. Secondly, the cost is now determined after the tia is completed or after analysis is completed and with regards to the mitigation ordinance. With this new process you can do it upfront and I think that's a huge way for things to be more predictable for the development community and for others who are concerned with what a proposed development -- the effect it might have. Then right now, the city -- this is really important as well. Right now we can only use fees for projects collected through the development process for a specific improvement. And that is specifically identified with this program. We spoke about it earlier. We have more flexibility within a service area to make improvements as per the roadway capacity plan, as per the judgment of transportation director and others. So that's -- those are some major differences. So now a couple of -- three questions, actually, that have come up a lot through

[4:26:56 PM]

our public engagement process that I'll go through, and that is the street impact fee calculated through a traffic impact analysis? And the answer is no. They're two different things. The fee, once set and adopted by city council, will be based on the type and intensity of the development as recorded in the building permit or as per the site plan, what exactly are they doing and they calculate the fee as I described earlier. The traffic impact analysis is still required and still will be required in certain instances and will require specific things. And if those things are in the roadway capacity plan, the development will receive a credit if they're going to construct those items. So that's the relationship. We don't see this replacing the tia process. They work complementary together. >> Alter: Very quickly clarify. If the tia was more than the impact fees they had owed could be asked to pay more than the impact fee? If the tia suggested that they should be doing that? >> Kitchen: I think that's not a simple answer. Do you mind if we turn -- we'll turn to that first after she finishes getting through that. >> I'll speak to that when I talk about proportionality in a second. >> Kitchen: That will be the time then. >> Essentially the difference between the two, does one replace the other, no. They're both going to be working together. So how is this different from rough proportionality? Rough proportionality is not a fee in itself. Rough proportionality does not require a development to contribute to the transportation network. It only checks that these requirement are fair. So it's a check and balance. Impact fees, on the other hand, are a calculation to determine a fee that a development would pay for transportation improvements relative

to what they're proposing. The code via the traffic impact analysis process and the new mitigation ordinance are also tools to identify

[4:28:58 PM]

and require enforcements. So impact fees will work in concert with -- concert with the tia process. The mitigation ordinance. Rough proportionality remains as it is as a check on that. So there could be some differences there perhaps. >> Especially depending on what the fee is set at relative to the maximum assessable fee. >> Kitchen: So to answer her -- councilmember's question, they could be required to pay an additional amount on top of the impact fee? Maybe yes, maybe no, depending on what the requirements are? >> Correct. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> That's correct. >> Alter: I want to explore that further but -- >> Kitchen: Okay. Keep going. >> Project time line, almost done, two more slides. So we have done the land use assumptions, service area, all that has been drafted. We are now working on the street network table as we work on the strategic mobility plan and then we will start working on the roadway capacity plan related to this project. So that's, you know, going to happen over the next several months. And this is our time line. So we're here in June updating y'all on what we're doing. We'd like to take the service areas and the land use assumptions for your approval in September. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Then we'll be behind the scenes working on the street network table and looking at what's capacity and that needs to be that subset to develop the roadway capacity plan. We'll be before the council with the strategic mobility plan once that is hopefully adopted we will then come quickly after with our roadway capacity plan, because the street impact see if an implementation tool for the new transportation plan. Uh-oh. >> Back. So we're thinking that that will be a year from now. Then y'all will be poised to start talking about the policy. You'll have the maximum allowable fee in each service area, and you can start talking about the nuances in that policy.

[4:31:00 PM]

So in for the worth, for example, they have 27 -- Fort Worth have 27 service areas but only assess a fee for about 19 of them, for whatever reasons they've decided with their policy, with their growth management policies, and such. So and then we have three months for that process, but I have a question mark because we don't know how -- you know, that's going to be a big community-wide discussion. But we're hoping maybe that could be done in September. And then I want to say a little bit about our check and balance, which is also required by the local government code, to have an impact fee advisory committee and the water utility has had one for quite a while. We worked with them and coordinated with them to, you know, quite frankly and also asked the members, you know, can you add this new impacted fee to your repertoire? You have a lot of experience with this, and they

wholeheartedly accepted and we've been working with them. Two new members have been added, one from Austin neighborhoods council and one from rica. There were two vacancies at the time we started this and they have been meeting since December and given us significant input on the service areas, on our public engagement plan. We've done a lot of public engagement. On our land use assumptions. And our next meeting is next month, where we'll be going through how we're going to look at developing those capacity projects in coordination with the strategic mobility plan. And then lastly we have a robust website. You can go there, find out what's going on. Also, the schedule for the impact fee advisory committee and when we'll be going to them and for which deliverables and then 30 minutes before each meeting we have what we call office hours so anyone from the public, development community to neighborhoods, anyone interested can come, talk with staff and consultants to get answers to any questions. And that's all I have. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Thank you. >> Kitchen: I'm sure we have lots of questions. Do you want to start, councilmember alter, and then we'll rotate our questions among everybody?

[4:33:01 PM]

>> Alter: Sure. So I would like further clarification on the interactions between the impact fee and [indiscernible] [Off mic] >> Alter: Thank you. Sorry about that. I would like to better understand the relationship between the impact fees and the traffic impact analysis, particularly for cases where the traffic impact analysis would seem to suggest a need to do improvements above and beyond the amount that could be covered by the impact fees. >> Leanne Miller with Austin transportation department. So as she said, the fee doesn't affect whether or not a development would be required to do a tia. If they triggered the trip generation to do a tia, they'd be required to do one, so it might identify improvements that are required to mitigate the effects of that development. If those projects that would be identified are in the roadway capacity plan, if they are part of the street impact fee, the developer by doing those improvements would get a credit for the impact fee otherwise due. If there are improvements above and beyond what might be required or memo what did might be in the roadway capacity plan, say a pedestrian hybrid basic on to provide a safe crossing between that development and a development across the street, that project might not be in the roadway capacity plan but it's required in the tia, the development would be required to construct or pay for that improvement. So that's just -- I mean, there are a lot of different examples of where the fee could be above or below what the transportation impact analysis might show. >> Alter: So that might be a way to get around the problem we identified before, with the service areas? So that if I had a development that had to pay impact fees and it was large enough that it had to do a tia and then if it did a tia and the tia said you have to do improvements across the street which are not in your service area, then their

[4:35:04 PM]

impact fees wouldn't apply in that case but they would still be required to some degree to do I'm sorry that were outside of their service area? >> Correct. >> Alter: How old that work if there's some fungibility about what we choose to require in a tia? So right now we have a practice where we're trying to get full payment on certain items, and if some items are in your service area and some are not, then it would affect your total fees. So how would that play out? >> So I guess the improvements that would be in your service area would be covered by the impact fee that you would be required to pay. Really the fee isn't going to be based on the specific improvement -- it might be an improvement in your service area that's not immediately adjacent to your site or within the tia scope of your site, right? The tia scope could be much more narrow than the service area. So the tia won't be necessarily paying for -- or identifying improvements that are being paid for by the impact fee. So I don't know if that's -- >> Alter: I guess I'm concerned about the situation where the tia identifies improvements across multiple service areas and at some point becomes -- obviously we have some criteria but if we're going to try and pay in full for improvements so they can happen but you get credit if you do one severance area, not the other service area, how do we determine which one? >> Yeah we'll have to work through that in the policy development. And ultimately rough proportionality is still going to be the check to see what's fair. So if you are pagan impact fee and then -- pagan impact fee and there are other requirements beyond that, we will have to check those against rough proportionality to see if those can also be required. >> Alter: Okay. I'll have to think that through. I like that that provides a

[4:37:06 PM]

way around the problem with the service areas for those larger developments. I'm less concerned about the service area boundaries when you have a small development than when we have a large one, but I would want to make sure that we have some clarity so that there's not gamesmanship. It sounds like it leans in the direction I would prefer, which is paying more, but I want to make sure that there are not loopholes and that we're doing it in a -- >> Absolutely. What I would recommend is our consultant has a lot of experience in implementing when you get to the policy point, which is you're bringing up a lot of interesting points that some other cities have dealt with, maybe not exactly this one, but perhaps. And so if you want to send questions through your staff to us, we're happy to get back to you on those items. Because you bring up a lot -- these are all things we've been thinking about as well but right now we're focused on the technical and then when we get into the policy -- >> Alter: Do you want know bring that one up again or do you have it captured. >> I believe we have it captured, yes. >> Flannigan: The projects that get funded through the street impact focus do they have to be related to the project that funded it? So -- >> No. >> Flannigan: So it's more of a bucket? >> Exactly. It has a lot of flexibility, a lot more than we have now with our current process, absolutely. >> Flannigan: So I think that helps address -- that helps address some of my concerns with the service area, because one could imagine that on average it balances out. That as long as you've got growth happening in all the service areas -- >> That's

right. >> Flannigan: -- And you might almost think about the service areas being drawn to represent equal areas of growth so that that may be another way to think about it. >> Kitchen: That's probably where Fort Worth charges in some areas and not in others, thinking about where the growth is happening, so. . . -- Is that -- did you have a question? >> With regard to what the

[4:39:07 PM]

fee could pay for, would something like -- would hybrid beacons be included in that? >> Only if they're part of the standard cross-section in a capacity project. So not a standalone pedestrian hybrid beacon, no. If you were -- >> The answer is maybe. [Laughter] >> If you were extending a street segment and provided a crossing with pedestrian hybrid beacon and that was part of the project as a whole in the extension, which would add capacity, then yes. But if it's an existing roadway and you're just providing a safe crossing that doesn't meet the roadway capacity definition we've been given by state law. >> Garza: Okay. I just sponsored about how cap metro and atd needs to cooperate -- not cooperate but work together with new development, I'm wondering if that in any way -- that new plan or whatever it is could be implemented into this, in that if we have -- like, in situations where you have infill development, where you have the sidewalks, you have the road, you probably have a light, but it would be a good opportunity for a bus stop or a curve cutout bus kind of lane, could this pay for that? And that's why I said hybrid beacon because maybe it's a hybrid beacon that makes them across to the bus stop that takes them in and is that maybe an interpretation of state law that could allow that? >> So our interpretation has been that it's only roadway capacity, so specific improvements for transit, for pedestrians, for bicyclists are not permitted. However, if we are improving the roadway in its entirety in some way for roadway capacity and the

[4:41:08 PM]

cross-section that we are, say, from a preliminary plan or corridor study includes bicycle lanes, a transit priority treatment, for example, then that would be eligible. >> Garza: And does state law specifically prohibit them and say you cannot use this or is this our interpretation. >> It's an interpretation. >> Garza: Has it been tested, like, by case law? >> I have to get back to you on that. I don't know. >> I'll just add that the mitigation ordinance changes that were passed this spring would allow for development to be required maybe to provide that pedestrian hybrid beacon if it was identified and adopted transportation plan or engineering studies. So the impact fee may might not be the tool to get that improvement. >> Garza: Okay. Would -- and I don't even know. I can't even -- I'm trying to think of a scenario where this would actually work, but like a bus priority lane, so if you're adding a lane and maybe you can't do a bus priority lane all the way down south congress but you can do it for portions

where the bus is passing up, would that be -- could that be covered with the impact fees? >> Yes. So long as the project is identified, so that's why we're starting with the strategic mobility plan. We will identify our transit enhanced network, which will include transit priority and what those improvements will look like, which will then translate to a cross-section for that segment of roadway that lives in the street network plan. And if we go to implement that segment, then that would be part of the total cost. One thing that staff has been talking about as well is also the idea of concrete for those transit corridors, as well, which would be part of the total project as well, like the way that we

[4:43:11 PM]

construct our roads with regards to supporting transit. So, you know, the answer is we're doing everything we can to look holistically at the roadway capacity plan and doing our proper transportation planning to know exactly what each street segment is supposed to do and in that case we feel like we're legit with using the fees on them. >> Garza: Okay. Thanks. >> Kitchen: Okay. I have some questions. First if I want to make sure I'm understanding the formula, which I think is on slide 12 about the impact fee calculation. >> Mm-hmm. >> Kitchen: So if I'm understanding correctly, that's the calculation but then by policy we can move it up or down? >> Correct. >> Kitchen: So the basic calculation is the recoverable cost of the rcp over the new growth. So the recoverable cost of the rcp, that goes back to the roadway capacity plan, right? >> Correct. >> Kitchen: That's what that is. >> Correct. >> Kitchen: Am I understanding correctly that the projects that are included in the rcp -- so the rcp is essentially a list of projects and their costs? Okay. >> Yes. >> Kitchen: Obviously the rcp is pretty important. >> Yes. >> Casar: And we'll be asked to -- >> Kitchen: And we'll be asked to approve the rcp in, let's -- let's see -- >> June of next year. >> Kitchen: June of next year, okay, so that's going to be important. And then it's divided by new growth. So basically you're taking -- I have to think about this in big picture. So I can understand the numbers. Basically you're taking everything you think is going to need to be done and you're dividing that by where the growth is happening so that essentially what is happening is everywhere there's growth, as measured by vehicle miles, everywhere there's growth pays a portion of the projects? >> Correct. >> Kitchen: Okay. So the assumption about the new growth, is that

[4:45:12 PM]

denominator, that -- is that coming out of the land use assumptions? >> Yes. >> Kitchen: Okay. All right. And the land use assumptions, that's something that welcome to council in September? >> Correct. >> Kitchen: Okay. On the land use assumptions then, we're looking at residential trips and employment trips. >> Mm-hmm. >> Kitchen: So what about recreation? Is that inherent or assumed in residential? Or where do we account for those -- that kind of trip? >> The land use assumptions are based on the

growth in dwelling units and employment commercial -- commercial square footage. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> So things like a recreation center I believe would be accounted for in commercial square footage, although I don't believe that city of Austin projects, building a new recreation center, we would pay an impact fee, but I think that would be a council policy decision. That new growth is based on the actual square footage in dwelling units. >> Kitchen: Basically, because this is the denominator, we're talking about growth in where people live and where they work, but what about the other things that they do that's land use? >> Councilmember, if I could provide some information. >> Kitchen: Sure. >> It goes on the assumption that we're using the trip duration rates out of it so their trips are associated with a commercial side or home E. If a recreational trip is generated from a home end, it is incorporated in that number of trips. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Anecdotally, when I was in school we were taught that an average household generates ten trips per day, ten individual trips. Those might be for work-related trips, those might be for whatever. >> Kitchen: Okay. So it's built into the assumptions. >> It is. >> Right. So you're either generating a trip from the work

[4:47:13 PM]

location or from the home location, all trips, whether it's from work to grocery store or work to the park is absorbed in that overall number. >> Kitchen: Okay. And does that -- how does that relate to multimodal trips? Or are we talking -- or do we include those? >> Or not? >> No. To the extent the ite formula accounts for, you know, the trip generation, if they're accounting for that type of -- you know, it's all-inclusive, so we're basing it on the ite, so it's going to be their methodology, whether they include a reduction for an assumption of multimodal trips. >> Councilmember, that's correct. Typically, when you're doing traffic engineering modeling, you do trip generation and then trip distribution and modes split based on the distribution. And so I would suspect where you'd want to take advantage of that is in the policy level. So, for instance, if you have an area that's highly transit oriented, you may not have as many capacity projects, roadway capacity projects that are needed. So by policy you could lower the fee in that area because you know more people are using transit. Remember the fee can only be paid -- only go towards roadway capacity and those ancillary elements part of the roadway capacity elements. >> Kitchen: But you might want to raise the fee if you have more transit in a particular service area. And if we're talking about the part of transit that you can pay for, which might be a dedicated lane, for example, right? >> Mm-hmm. >> Kitchen: The point you're making is that the impact fee calculation is done in this way and then for policy reasons you can raise or lower it, right? >> Yes.

[4:49:13 PM]

>> Kitchen: So if you -- so you don't have to -- you don't have to capture every single assumption in the calculation because those things that might be -- might be not built into your assumptions that are more policy related, you can adjust for them when you're doing your rate setting, right? >> Yes. >> Kitchen: Is that right? >> And so just one clarification, when you can raise or lower, obviously, you can't go above 100% of the cost you're assuming for that service area. >> Kitchen: Right. >> You can go 10% or you can go 15% or whatever, but you can't go above what the total cost estimate for the roadway capacity improvements in that area. >> Kitchen: Okay. Again, I have lots of questions about the roadway capacity plan, but we can get to that later. I'm mostly wanting to make sure I understand what's coming to us in September at this point. >> Sure. >> Kitchen: So the service areas we've already talked about. So the -- okay. Let me -- I have one last question and then see if anybody else has a final question. I want to go back to the transit, the response, you know? Make sure I'm understanding it. So tell me again when you could or couldn't pay for transit-related improvements on a roadway table way? If it's built into the -- if it's built into the roadway capacity plan? >> Right. If it's part of the street cross-section, standard cross-section assumed in the roadway capacity plan, it could be paid for. If it's not, if it's not part of the roadway capacity plan, it wouldn't be able to be paid for with an impact fee. >> Kitchen: Why wouldn't you put it in the roadway capacity plan? >> If it's not something that -- if it's a standalone project, like, for instance, if you're just adding an

[4:51:15 PM]

enhanced transit shelter at a brt station, that is not adding roadway capacity. That's not a roadway capacity project. That's not going to be included in the roadway capacity plan so then you could not pay for it with a street impact fee. >> Kitchen: I can see that one. But I'm thinking more of, like, the signal improvements for buses, dedicated lanes, things like that that are actually on the road. >> Right. You could definitely include that. >> Kitchen: I can't imagine a scenario when you wouldn't go ahead and put that in the roadway capacity plan. >> Or a new shelter, a brand-new one, not a stop that's existing, but something that would be new. >> Right. If it's been identified and, you know, through the planning process, in coordination with cap metro and we know that's going to be new and it's going to be a part of the cross-section and it's identified ahead of time we can definitely include it. If it's something that comes about after the plan has been adopted, we can amend the plan to include, you know, additional projects, the study gets updated every five years so that gives us an opportunity to refresh as plans evolve. And we know more about what the future needs are. >> Garza: Is that a requirement of state law? >> Yes. >> Garza: That it has to be in the plan? >> Yes. >> Garza: Okay. >> Kitchen: The five year window is a long time for some of these improvements. Can we update them? >> It's a requirement to update every five years but a city can choose to update sooner for whatever reason. >> Kitchen: I think it would be helpful for me to understand the areas in which we've done a legal interpretation. So that we can -- you know, as we're getting towards the policy decisions, we can think about -- you know, we can think about areas where there's interpretation so I'll ask you some more questions, but if you could provide us information about where the law is, which of the areas perhaps that are more gray and we're

interpreting in line with the way others have interpreted, that would be helpful. I also would like to see an

[4:53:16 PM]

example of a roadway capacity plan. So we can get that -- maybe you just need to point me to one or to the old one. >> Sure. >> Kitchen: Does anybody else have any questions? >> Alter: I have a couple small ones. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Alter: When will we be able to see the street network table and transportation criteria manual? I just didn't see it on the time line? >> Right. So the street network table is -- will be completed after we do our scenario modeling for the Austin strategic mobility plan, which will be available sometime october/november. >> Alter: Okay. So the technical manual will be -- >> But the TCM is -- the transportation criteria manual is a separate project, and we are working to have that updated, which is new cross-sections and other transportation criteria, site distance requirements, driveway placements, all types of different things about how we build our roadway network. That's on a time line to also be completed in 2018, and we can work with your office on how -- we don't have a process right now on how we would communicate with council on that. That's usually a rules posting process. The council does not -- does not approve our criteria manuals. That's an administrative process. >> Alter: Okay. >> But we're happy to work with you all through cmo on how you might get involved with that. >> Alter: I don't know that I want to get involved. [Laughter] >> Alter: Just owned where it was in the process. So the street network table you're expecting october/november. >> Yes. >> Alter: And then the transportation criteria material -- manual sometime in 2018? >> Correct. In early 2018. We're working on that now, yes. >> Alter: Okay. And then what we're going to

[4:55:18 PM]

get in September, can you go over that one more time, please, so that I make sure I'm clear? You're going to be asking us to approve the service area so we've already identified some questions that we have. >> Right. >> Alter: -- Over that and I think it might be good if we can share -- maybe have a discussion to make sure because I think there was enough questions over that before it's coming back to council. >> Kitchen: Okay. >> Alter: Then the land use assumptions. >> Right. >> Alter: And you are proceeding with those, assuming they're going to be potentially modified by codenext. And those land use assumptions fit into the calculation for the denominator? >> Yes. >> Correct. >> Yes. >> Alter: Okay. >> My math knowledge. >> Alter: Sorry. I've got all my sheets here I'm trying to -- that would mean if it goes up, the fee goes up -- >> Kitchen: The fee goes down. >> The fee goes down, right. And the land use assumptions, a summary of the work that we've done thus far that's been presented to the impact fee advisory committee, that's on that website, the link that's in the slides. It's -- I think it's maybe 12, 15

pages. It's not super detailed, but you can see kind of the methodology for developing those land assumptions. >> Alter: What are the fee levels in, like, Fort Worth? Can you share those with us so we can have a sense of what the magnitude of this might look like in -- >> Yeah. I don't know off the top of my head. >> Real world scenarios. As much as I want to charge growth for the costs, I also want to be mindful that we're not -- you know, it seems like in some ways we're going to be charging more in some of the areas where we most want the growth, and so I'm just mindful of getting that balance right. >> Yeah. >> We can provide that to you, definitely.

[4:57:18 PM]

>> Alter: Okay. >> Kitchen: Okay. Thank you very much. Appreciate you bringing this forward. It will be -- it will be a lot to dig into. We've been digging into it over the last year or two, but this is very helpful. Starting to look real. So all right. Thank you, all. We're adjourned right at 5:00. [Adjourned]